

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 26-50, 52-61 and 63-69 are pending in the application. Claims 1-25 were previously cancelled. Claims 51 and 62 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 29, 38-41, 45, 50, 62 and 66 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated September 14, 2005, the previous grounds for the rejections are maintained. Claims 26-30, 32, 66-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over Boykin et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0078461. Claims 31, 33-56, 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Boykin et al. in view of Lahr et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0046405. Claims 31, 33-56, 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Boykin et al. in view of Lahr et al. and further in view of Rao et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,078,929.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Interview at the USPTO

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview at the USPTO of October 6, 2005.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 103(a) based on Boykin and Lahr

A new Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 is submitted to swear behind Boykin et al., which has a filing date of December 14, 2000, and Lahr et al., which has a filing date of January 21, 2001. The Rule 131 Declaration and the associated exhibits address the Examiner's comments regarding the previously submitted Declaration, and remove the Boykin and Lahr references as prior art. Accordingly, all the pending claims are believed to be allowable.

Amendments to the claims

During the interview, the Examiner expressed concern regarding some of the terms used in the claims. In response, Applicants have amended the claims at issue, to further clarify and define what is claimed. Applicants do not believe that the scope of these claims is changed by these amendments. Applicants further believe that these amendments help clarify the differences between the cited references and the claim language.

Applicants are aware that this Amendment and Reply is in response to a Final Office Action. However, Applicants believe these amendments are proper since they (a) are accompanied by a Declaration under Rule 131, which removes the finality of the Office Action, and (b) only serve to clarify the language of the claims, and therefore do not require a new search and/or consideration.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner

reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARDMESSER LAW GROUP



George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: November 9, 2005

910 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191